

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5218	COUNTY	Orange
APPLICANT	Newport Beach, City of	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$487,000
PROJECT TITLE	Newport Bay - San Diego Creek IRWMP	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$650,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Synthesize all of the ongoing studies and programs into a unified and integrated watershed management plan to address the water supply, water quality, and habitat preservation goals and objectives to the combined benefit of all interests. The objectives include addressing data gaps, develop measures of success, collaboration, improve water quality, restore ecosystem functions, develop harbor policy, restore surface and groundwater interaction, improve coordination with agencies, and improve public awareness of watershed issues.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 9

Comment: The proposal includes a 25% funding match. The application includes a work plan with broadly defined work items, a summary budget, and schedule which are all consistent with each other. The work plan is clear and implementable and seems reasonable. However, the schedule seems ambitious and lacks detail. The work plan is more focused on the implementation of GIS and web site development. The budget does not include a breakdown by local cost match v. grant request, staff rates, hours, and quantities.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The work plan focuses on the Newport Bay watershed. The watershed is well defined and represents an appropriate area for watershed management based upon the description and the maps provided. The applicant describes the region's internal boundaries, water-related infrastructure, land use divisions, and environmental resources. However, water quantity, community makeup, and economic conditions are not addressed. The applicant lists regional agencies but they are not fully described. Also, the applicant does not indicate why the City of Newport Beach has submitted two separate proposals for two closely related watersheds (see Pin #5220).

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant states that the Newport Bay watershed is a state priority watershed and that the IRWMP objectives are to address TMDLs and other water quality issues. The applicant describes generally what the regional planning objectives are for the IRWMP. However, the application does not explain how objectives have been determined, how they fit together, and what specific problems they are meant to address.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant expresses the need to integrate the various water management strategies in the watershed and summarizes many of the programs in Table 1. The applicant appears to understand the basis for the water-related program efforts and how they would be integrated into a comprehensive IRWMP. The proposed IRWMP addresses water quality as the main water management strategy but considers other strategies. A higher score would have been given if the applicant included more discussion on how the water quality concerns impact water supply.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: Implementation is not addressed directly but indirectly in Section 2.2. The applicant proposes a watershed executive committee and a watershed strategic collaboration group to address implementation and related issues. Examples of how this process would work would improve the proposal. There is no specific discussion on project performance.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The work plan analyzes the water quality impacts that resulted in the watershed requiring TMDLs. The applicant states that comprehensive ecosystem/wildlife resources and habitat concerns will be addressed as part of the IRWMP. The applicant broadly states it will identify necessary steps to meet CEQA in the planning process, but does not discuss any CEQA or other environmental documentation that may have already been done in 21 existing studies.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant cites many local planning documents, ordinances, management plans, and 21 existing studies as the data and technical analysis components of the IRWMP. However, they do not provide any content summary or highlights of these individual documents. The applicant proposes extensive data gathering and use of models and cites how GIS will be used to identify data gaps and as a management tool.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: A website will be developed to disseminate data to stakeholders and to meet statewide data needs. The website will be the main data management and stakeholder information tool. It will feature a technical data section, a secured section for internal communications, and a public section of summaries, announcements, and input. This will also include GIS information. However, the applicant does not discuss how the IRWMP will meet statewide data needs. Also, the proposal concentrates on electronic means of disseminating data which may not be accessible to some members of the public.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Several levels of agency stakeholders are identified, while intention to engage other interest groups is expressed. The applicant provides a process for stakeholder collaboration for their IRWMP using two planning bodies, a watershed executive committee and a strategic collaborative group. However, the applicant does not address environmental justice concerns and it appears that stakeholder participation has not begun.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: Applicant does not request waiver or reduction of funding match. The applicant does not address DACs or other environmental justice issues. The applicant does not address any benefits for DACs as a result of the IRWMP.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Several studies and plans are listed in a table or cited in the text. The plans, ordinances, and codes the applicant proposes to review appear to be extensive. The proposal is intended to address lack of coordination amongst the studies by an IRWMP that will integrate them. The applicant proposes to use GIS and a web-based compendium to help integrate various plans and also anticipates possible conflict between existing plans and the IRWMP, which would be resolved at the policy level of the management committee. However, the applicant does not include details, examples, or thorough rationale of how the conflict-resolution process would work.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant states that the IRWMP will provide for coordination and cooperation with local, state, and federal agencies, and specifically mentions coordination with land use planning. The proposed watershed executive committee will coordinate collaboration among agencies. Funding will be provided for federal regulatory staff. These are processes and organizational structures proposed for the IRWMP and are not currently in place. More detail and rationale, preferably with examples, about how proposed processes and proposed committees would work would make the proposal stronger.

TOTAL SCORE: 57